

moneys that we can save should be going to deficit reduction, and I would certainly encourage the gentlemen when those amendments are offered and certainly when we talk about the lockbox aspects of putting those moneys towards deficit reduction, that we will see that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I note with interest the gentlewoman from Arkansas preceded me in this Chamber by one term, part of the 103rd Congress. I know not her voting record personally, but I do not know the former majority is on record as voting for the largest tax increase in history, a tax increase which hit so many Americans in the wallet as to be just grossly unfair, and went on with the gasoline tax the average impact of which being in excess of an average of \$400 per year in additional energy payments for every family in America, regardless of their socioeconomic status. So I would contend with the lady and my other good friends on the other side of the aisle, I do not believe we can tax ourselves to prosperity, and nor, although there are certainly some noble aspects to the notion of a deficit lockbox, I believe we have to return the money to the people who earned that money in the first place.

If I could speak for just a few moments on the 5 minutes I have, I thank my good friends on the other side for their restraint. I would also add that I certainly welcome tonight's meaningful dialog in stark contrast to the hysterics we heard earlier today.

I mentioned that earlier today during the debate I cannot for the life of me understand why anyone from any political party would choose to compare their opposition to the Third Reich of Nazi Germany or to slave holders. I believe that was inexcusable, but I welcome certainly the tone tonight which has changed.

You and I just happen to have a difference of opinion. I think we also have a different interpretation on some of the numbers, but let me yield in the interests of fairness to my friend from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I just want to say that we have also seen three consecutive years of deficit reduction. I would just like to encourage the gentleman to make sure that he knows that there are those of us who are speaking out for deficit reduction.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would point out that deficit reduction came at the expense of hard-working taxpayers who would like to keep more of their money in their own pocket, and if we cut taxes and cut the deficit and build this economy, then that will be the answer for everyone including those trapped right now in the prison, if you will, of welfare, and a system that is broken, and we all agree is in need of some radical change.

We asked for that type of change, and that is what we are working to do with your majority bill, H.R. 4. We welcome your thoughts on it, but we would ask

you to take a much closer look at the numbers you purport with reference to the Federal lunch program. One is tempted to recall the words of our good friend from California, "There you go again," not talking about the real numbers. We call for increases in the school lunch program of 4.5 percent over the next 5 years, an increase over 5 years of \$1.1 billion in expenditures, and we are getting the job done while we are hearing a lot of rhetoric.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman very much.

I would like to reference your remarks where you just said there was an increase in school lunch program, and I want to, and I appreciate the time to respond to that, there is not an increase in the school lunch program. There is a cut.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentlewoman has to understand how on Earth can you increase a program, now, in fairness, if you are saying there is a reduction in anticipated increases, I would certainly contend that is an interesting way to define a cut.

Ms. PELOSI. I wish the gentleman would wait until my time so we can continue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLEMENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### THE CURRENT WELFARE SYSTEM DOES NOT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about something that I think we all agree upon. There has been a lot of discussion, a lot of debate today, and it seems that one thing that we do agree upon is the current welfare system simply does not work, and instead of requiring work, it actually punishes those who go to work. Instead of instilling personal responsibility, it encourages dependence on the Government, and instead of encouraging marriage and family stability, it penalizes two-parent families and rewards teenage pregnancies.

We all agree welfare must be drastically changed, and that welfare should only offer transitional assistance leading to work, not leading to a way of life.

Now, I am one of the cosponsors of the Deal substitute, and we are committed in our bill to making some pretty major changes. Our bill is the only bill that will be considered which en-

sures that its savings are used for deficit reduction.

Now, I think that is an important goal that many of us share, and our bill is the only bill that ensures that our savings will be used for that purpose. We support welfare reform that emphasizes work. It emphasizes personal responsibility. It emphasizes family stability.

The Deal substitute imposes some pretty tough work requirements while providing opportunities for education and training and for child care and health care to support working people.

□ 2215

It provides States with the resources necessary in order for welfare reform to succeed without shifting costs to local governments or without creating unfunded mandates, and it gives the State the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs they need without sacrificing accountability of the Nation's taxpayer's dollars. We believe that real welfare reform must be about replacing a welfare check with a paycheck.

The Deal substitute's time-limited work first program is designed to get people into the work force as quickly as possible by requiring all recipients to enter a self-sufficiency plan within 30 days of receiving their benefits.

The Republican welfare bill allows recipients to receive cash benefits for up to 2 years before they are required to work or even to look for work.

The Deal substitute also encourages welfare recipients to leave welfare for work by providing adequate funding for safe child care and by extending transitional medicaid assistance from 1 year to 2 years.

The Deal substitute provides the necessary resources for welfare recipients to become self-sufficient, but it also requires recipients to be responsible for their own actions by setting clear time limits on benefits. No benefits will be paid to anyone, and this is extremely important, no benefits will be paid to anyone who refuses to work, who refuses to look for work or who turns down a job.

In addition to making individuals responsible for their own welfare, we demand that both parents be responsible for their children. The Deal substitute includes the toughest child support system ever to make sure that the noncustodial parents simply don't walk away from the children that they helped bring into this world.

The sponsors of the Deal substitute recognize that in order to reform welfare States must have the flexibility to design and administer welfare programs that are tailored to their unique needs, to the unique characteristic of their States. And we believe that States should not have to go through any cumbersome Federal waiver process in order to implement innovative reforms in their welfare programs.

The Deal substitute, in fact, puts into place a Federal model for the work